

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the Office Action mailed May 19, 2004.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for recognizing in paragraphs 20 and 21 of the Office Action that claims 5-11 are allowable. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that each of claims 1-4 and 12-21 also patentably distinguish over the art of record.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the Japanese language references enclosed with Information Disclosure Statements submitted on October 3, 2000 and January 15, 2004 have not been fully considered. The reason given was, "Japanese art was not translated nor did Applicant attempt to explain why it was relevant." With respect to the IDS submitted on October 3, 2000, Japanese Publication No. 11-196081's relevance is discussed in the specification starting at page 4, line 14. With respect to the IDS submitted on January 15, 2004, Japanese Publication No. 10-336745 was cited in a Japanese Office Action issued March 16, 2004, and an English translation of the relevant portions of that Office Action were submitted along with that Information Disclosure Statement. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner fully consider these references, which were submitted in accordance with the rules of practice (See also, M.P.E.P. § 609).

In accordance with paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Applicant has corrected typographical errors appearing in the Specification on pages 17 and 18.

In paragraphs 3-17 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1-21 to replace the abbreviation AP and APs with "wireless access point," STA or STAs with "plurality of wireless access terminal devices," STA with "one of said plurality of wireless access terminal devices," and SV device with "key management server device."

In claim 4, 5, and 15, the limitation that “k is greater than 1” has been added to overcome the indefiniteness objection in paragraphs 7-8 of the Office Action. Also in claims 4 and 15, the phrase “for said (k – 1) encrypted keys” has been replaced with “said first preset interval” to clarify the length relationship of the second present interval.

The limitation “[to advise/for notifying] . . . of that effect” in claims 5-11 has been eliminated. The “lumped STA encrypted key updating request” limitation of claim 11 and the “generated encrypted key” limitation of claim 12 have also been eliminated. In claim 14, the “rate of one at a preset time interval” has been changed to recite “a rate of one-by-one at a preset time interval.”

In claim 16, the phrase “the nth encrypted key,” has been changed to “an nth encrypted key” to provide the proper antecedent basis. In addition, the phrase “an optional” has been replaced with “another” and the phrase “the encrypted key” has been replaced with “another encrypted key” to clarify the proper antecedent basis of the latter phrase and to clarify the former phrase. In claim 19, the phrase “an optional” has been eliminated. Also with respect to claim 16, Applicant respectfully submits that keys can be stored by a wireless access point, and the key management server device, therefore Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdrawal this objection made in paragraph 16 of the Office Action.

In paragraphs 18-19 of the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Farley et al., LAN Times Guide to Security and Data Integrity (Farley). The Examiner’s rejection on this ground is respectfully traversed.

Among the limitations of independent claims 1 and 12 which are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record is a requirement that the “updated encrypted key [is delivered] to said wireless access point and to said *plurality* of wireless access terminal devices.” (Emphasis added). Farley discloses, on page 219, that “only . . . a single key for each pair of people” should be used so that communications between each pair of people are secure. Farley also discloses the well known Kerberos system on page

220, where only one secret key is known to each person, and only that person and the central key distribution center know that secret key. More particularly, Farley teaches that a session key is shared between Bob and Alice, who use the session key to encrypt their communications with each other during each communication session, and that such key is distributed by the central key distribution center. Farley does not disclose that the key management server delivers a key to more than a pair. In the present invention, the key is shared among an access point and a plurality of terminal devices (i.e., more than a pair) so that each device may encrypt communication with each other device using the same key. In the absence of any disclosure or suggestion of this feature of the invention, independent claims 1 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-11 and 13-21 depend from claims 1 and 12 respectively, and include all the limitations found therein, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons.

New claims 22-25 have been added to more fully claim Applicant's invention.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: August 10, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert G. Gingher

Registration No.: 45,755

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant